

Causal Rate Distortion Function on Abstract Alphabets: Optimal Reconstruction and Properties

Photios A. Stavrou, Charalambos D. Charalambous and Christos K. Kourtellaris

ECE Department, University of Cyprus, Green Park, Aglantzias 91,

P.O. Box 20537, 1687, Nicosia, Cyprus

e-mail: stavrou.fotios@ucy.ac.cy, chadcha@ucy.ac.cy, kourtellaris.christos@ucy.ac.cy

Abstract—A causal rate distortion function with a general fidelity criterion is formulated on abstract alphabets and a coding theorem is derived. Existence of the minimizing kernel is shown using the topology of weak convergence of probability measures. The optimal reconstruction kernel is derived, which is causal, and certain properties of the causal rate distortion function are presented.

I. INTRODUCTION

Given a distortion or fidelity constraint between source sequences $X^\infty \triangleq \{X_i\}_{i=0}^\infty \in \mathcal{X}^\infty \triangleq \times_{i=0}^\infty \mathcal{X}_i$ and reproduction sequences $Y^\infty \triangleq \{Y_i\}_{i=0}^\infty \in \mathcal{Y}^\infty \triangleq \times_{i=0}^\infty \mathcal{Y}_i$, non-causal codes achieve the rate distortion function (RDF) of the source, which is the optimal performance theoretically attainable. The RDF is described in [1] for memoryless sources, in [2] for stationary ergodic sources, in [3] for information and distortion stable processes, and in [4] using the information spectrum method. The RDF for general sources on Polish spaces (complete separable metric spaces) and its properties are discussed extensively in [5].

Causal codes as defined in [6] are a sub-class of non-causal codes, with the addition constraint on the reproduction coder (cascade of encoder-decoder) such that Y_i depends on the past and present source symbols $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_i\}$ but not on the future symbols $\{X_{i+1}, X_{i+2}, \dots\}$, thus, $Y_i = f_i(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_i) \forall i$, where $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ are measurable functions called reproduction coders.

Causal codes are extensively analyzed in [6] using entropy type criteria (entropy of reproduction coder), further investigated in [7] where side information is present, while [8] consider stationary sources at high resolution. The rate loss due to causality for Gaussian stationary sources with memory and mean square distortion is analyzed in [9], and recently in [10].

Zero-delay codes are a sub-class of causal codes, with the additional constraint on the reproduction coder such that the reproduction Y_i is done at the same time the corresponding source symbol X_i is encoded, that is, both encoding and decoding are done causally. Sequential codes as defined in [11] and applied in [12] are causal zero-delay codes such that the reproduction of each source symbol is done sequentially following the time ordering $X_0, Y_0, X_1, Y_1, \dots$.

The objective of this paper is to impose a causal constraint on the reproduction coder, and formulate the causal source coding

problem with fidelity criterion via rate distortion theory, on general alphabets using the topology of weak convergence of probability measures. The results include the following.

- 1) Information theoretic definition of causal rate distortion function as an optimization problem in which the reproduction conditional distribution satisfies a causality constraint.
- 2) Source coding theorem for directed information and distortion stable processes.
- 3) Expression of the optimal causal reconstruction distribution and properties of the causal RDF.

Causal Rate Distortion Function (CRDF).

The precise definition of causal codes is stated below and it is found in [6].

Definition 1.1: (Causal Reproduction Coder) A reproduction coder is called causal if for all $i \leq n$

$$f_i(x^n) = f_i(\tilde{x}^n) \text{ whenever } x^i = \tilde{x}^i$$

A source code is called causal if its induced reproduction coder is causal.

From Definition 1.1, it follows that the reproduction coder is causal if and only if the following Markov chain holds $(X_{i+1}, X_{i+2}, \dots) \Leftrightarrow (X^i, Y^{i-1}) \Leftrightarrow Y_i, i = 0, 1, \dots$

Assume an average distortion constraint

$$E\{d_{0,n}(X^n, Y^n)\} \leq D, \quad d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \rho_i(x^i, y^i)$$

where $D \geq 0$, $d_{0,n}(\cdot, \cdot)$ a non-negative distortion function.

Consider causal reproduction coders defined in Definition 1.1. Define the causal convolution of conditional distributions by

$$\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) \triangleq \otimes_{i=0}^n P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}, X^i}(dy_i|y^{i-1}, x^i)$$

Since a reproduction coder is causal if and only if the above Markov chain holds, then the reproduction conditional distribution of a causal coder satisfies

$$P_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) = \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n), \quad P - a.s \quad (1)$$

Substituting (1) into mutual information $I(X^n; Y^n)$ it follows that for causal coders the information theoretic RDF for which

an operational meaning will be sought, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R^c(D) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}: E\{d_{0,n}(X^n, Y^n)\} \leq D} \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n}} \\ &\quad \log \left(\frac{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)}{P_{Y^n}(dy^n)} \right) \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) P_{X^n}(dx^n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(P_{X^n}, \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the joint distribution $P_{X^n, Y^n}(dx^n, dy^n)$ for causal codes is uniquely defined by $P_{X^n, Y^n}(dx^n, dy^n) = \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) \otimes P_{X^n}(dx^n)$. Note that (2) is precisely the expression consider in [11] to derive coding theorem for sequential codes. It is easy to verify that $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(P_{X^n}, \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n})$ is the directed information from X^n to Y^n , $I(X^n \rightarrow Y^n) \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^n I(X^i; Y_i | Y^{i-1})$, subject to the requirement that the source is not affected by past reconstruction symbols, that is, $\otimes_{i=0}^n P_{X_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}(dx_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}) = \otimes_{i=0}^n P_{X_i|X^{i-1}}(dx_i|x^{i-1}) = P_{X^n}(dx^n)$. However, if the causality constraint (1) is not imposed, the conditional distribution $\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)$ in (2) should be replaced by $P_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)$, and the resulting expression is the classical RDF. Since, by the chain rule $P_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) = \otimes_{i=0}^n P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}=y^{i-1}, X^n=x^n}(dy_i|Y^{i-1}=y^{i-1}, X^n=x^n)$, in general the classical RDF solution yields reconstructions of $Y_i = y_i$ which depends on future values of the source symbols ($X_{i+1} = x_{i+1}, \dots, X_n = x_n$), in addition to its past reconstruction symbols $Y^{i-1} = y^{i-1}$, and past and present symbols $X^i = x^i$. On the other hand (1) implies causality.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND CODING THEOREMS

Let $\mathbb{N}^n \triangleq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \triangleq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. The source and reconstruction alphabets are sequences of Polish spaces [13] $\{\mathcal{X}_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{Y}_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\}$, respectively, (e.g., $\mathcal{Y}_t, \mathcal{X}_t$ are complete separable metric spaces), associated with their corresponding measurable spaces $(\mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_t))$ and $(\mathcal{Y}_t, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_t))$. Sequences of alphabets are identified with the product spaces $(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n})) \triangleq \times_{k=0}^n (\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_k))$, and $(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n})) \triangleq \times_{k=0}^n (\mathcal{Y}_k, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_k))$. The source and reconstruction are processes denoted by $X^n \triangleq \{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$, $X_n \in \mathcal{X}_n$, and by $Y^n \triangleq \{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$, $Y_n \in \mathcal{Y}_n$, respectively. Probability measures on any measurable space $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}))$ are denoted by $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Z})$. It is assumed that the σ -algebras $\sigma\{X^{-1}\} = \sigma\{Y^{-1}\} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$.

Definition 2.1: Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})), (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}))$ be measurable spaces in which $\mathcal{Y}$ is a Polish Space.

A stochastic Kernel on $\mathcal{Y}$ given $\mathcal{X}$ is a mapping $q : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying the following two properties:

1) For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the set function $q(\cdot; x)$ is a probability measure (possibly finitely additive) on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$.

2) For every $F \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$, the function $q(F; \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ -measurable.

The set of all such stochastic Kernels is denoted by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{X})$.

Stochastic kernels are classified into non-causal and causal as follows.

Definition 2.2: Given measurable spaces $(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}))$, $(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}))$, and their product spaces, data compression channels are defined as follows.

- 1) A *Non-Causal Data Compression Channel* is a stochastic kernel $q_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- 2) A *Causal Product Data Compression Channel* is a convolution of a sequence of causal stochastic kernels defined by

$$\vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \triangleq \otimes_{i=0}^n q_i(dy_i; y^{i-1}, x^i)$$

where $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_i; \mathcal{Y}_{0,i-1} \times \mathcal{X}_{0,i})$, $i = 0, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The set of such convolution of causal kernels is denoted by $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$.

A. Information Theoretic Causal Rate Distortion Function

This section gives the abstract formulation of $R^c(D)$. Given a source probability measure $\mu_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ and a reconstruction kernel $\vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ consistent with causal reproduction coder, define the following probability measures.

P1: The joint measure $P_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{0,n}(G_{0,n}) &\triangleq (\mu_{0,n} \otimes \vec{q}_{0,n})(G_{0,n}), \quad G_{0,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n}} \vec{q}_{0,n}(G_{0,n}, x^n; x^n) \mu_{0,n}(dx^n) \end{aligned}$$

where G_{0,n,x^n} is the x^n -section of $G_{0,n}$ at point x^n defined by $G_{0,n,x^n} \triangleq \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,n} : (x^n, y^n) \in G_{0,n}\}$ and $\otimes$ denotes the convolution.

P2: The marginal measure $\nu_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{0,n}(F_{0,n}) &\triangleq P_{0,n}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times F_{0,n}), \quad F_{0,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n}} \vec{q}_{0,n}(F_{0,n}; x^n) \mu_{0,n}(dx^n) \end{aligned}$$

P3: The product measure $\pi_{0,n} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}) \mapsto [0, 1]$ of $\mu_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ and $\nu_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{0,n}(G_{0,n}) &\triangleq (\mu_{0,n} \times \nu_{0,n})(G_{0,n}), \quad G_{0,n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{0,n}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n}} \nu_{0,n}(G_{0,n,x^n}) \mu_{0,n}(dx^n) \end{aligned}$$

The precise information measure used to define CRDF is the mutual information between two sequences of random processes X^n and Y^n whose distributions are consistent with the definition of the causal reproduction coder, e.g., generated via **P1-P3**. Hence, by the construction of probability measures **P1-P3**, and the chain rule of relative entropy [13]:

$$I(X^n; Y^n) \triangleq \mathbb{D}(P_{0,n} || \pi_{0,n}) \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n}} \log \left(\frac{d(\mu_{0,n} \otimes \vec{q}_{0,n})}{d(\mu_{0,n} \times \nu_{0,n})} \right) d(\mu_{0,n} \otimes \vec{q}_{0,n}) \\ &= \int \log \left(\frac{\vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n)}{\nu_{0,n}(dy^n)} \right) \vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \mu_{0,n}(dx^n) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\equiv \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n}) \quad (5)$$

Note that (5) states that mutual information is expressed as a functional of $\{\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n}\}$ denoted by $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$. Also, if the causality assumption on the reproduction coder is not imposed, then $I(X^n; Y^n) = \mathbb{I}(\mu_{0,n}, q_{0,n})$, which is how classical RDF is defined.

The next lemma gives equivalent statements which are consistent with causal reproduction coders in terms of causal convolution of reconstruction kernels, mutual information, directed information, and conditional independence.

Lemma 2.3: The following are equivalent for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- 1) $q_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) = \vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n)$ a.s., where $\vec{q}_{0,n}$ is given in Definition 2.2-2).
- 2) For each $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, $Y_i \Leftrightarrow (X^i, Y^{i-1}) \Leftrightarrow (X_{i+1}, X_{i+2}, \dots, X_n)$, forms a Markov chain.
- 3) $I(X^n; Y^n) = I(X^n \rightarrow Y^n)$.
- 4) For each $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, $Y^i \Leftrightarrow X^i \Leftrightarrow X_{i+1}$ forms a Markov chain.

Proof: The prove is omitted due to space limitation. $\blacksquare$
 $I(X^n; Y^n) = I(X^n \rightarrow Y^n) \equiv \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ is a functional of $\{\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n}\}$. Hence, the information definition of a causal rate distortion is defined by optimizing $\mathbb{I}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ over $\vec{q}_{0,n}$ which satisfies a distortion constraint.

Definition 2.4: (Causal Information Rate Distortion Function) Suppose $d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \rho_i(x^i, y^i)$, where $\rho_i : \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, is a sequence of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_i) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}_i)$ -measurable distortion functions, and let $\vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)$ (assuming is non-empty) denotes the average distortion or fidelity constraint defined by

$$\vec{Q}_{0,n}(D) \triangleq \left\{ \vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n}) : \ell(\vec{q}_{0,n}) \triangleq \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n}} d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) (\vec{q}_{0,n} \otimes \mu_{0,n})(dx^n, dy^n) \leq D \right\}, \quad D \geq 0 \quad (6)$$

Define

$$R_{0,n}^c(D) \triangleq \inf_{\vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)} \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n}) \quad (7)$$

The operational meaning of CRDF is established via $R^c(D) \triangleq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{0,n}^c(D)$, provided the limit exists.

Clearly, $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ is characterized by minimizing $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ over the causal convolution measure $\vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)$.

B. Coding Theorems for Causal and Sequential Codes

This section gives an operational meaning to $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ via coding theorems. There are two cases, sequential codes and causal codes.

Sequential Codes. Coding theorems for sequential codes are established in [11] for the finite alphabet case, and two-dimensional source $X^{T,N} \triangleq \{X_{t,n} : t = 0, \dots, T, n = 0, \dots, N\}$, where t represents time index and n represents spatial index, under the assumption that

$P(X^{T,N}) = \otimes_{n=0}^N P(X_n^T)$, and $\{X_n^T : n = 0, \dots, N\}$ are identically distributed, and the distortion constraint is $E_{X^{T,N}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{n=0}^N \rho(x_{t,n}, y_{t,n}) \right\} \leq D_t, t = 0, 1, \dots, T$. With a slight modification of the per-letter distortion function above, it can be shown that the coding theorem in [12] is still valid, and that the corresponding sequential RDF is given by $R^{SRD}(D) \equiv R^c(D)$. The coding theorem is derived using strong typicality.

Causal Codes. Here we describe a coding theorem for causal codes.

Definition 2.5: (Causal Code) A $(n, 2^{nR}, D)$ causal source code of block length n , and rate R consists of an encoding mapping $e(\cdot)$, $e : \mathcal{X}_{0,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{nR}\}$ and a sequence of decoder mapping $\{g_i\}_{i=0}^n(\cdot)$, $g_i : \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{nR}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ such that the sequence of reproduction coders $\{f_i = g_i \circ e\}_{i=0}^n$ are causal.

Definition 2.6: (Achievable Rate) A rate distortion pair (R, D) is called achievable if $\forall \epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n there exists a $(n, 2^{nR}, D)$ causal code such that

$$\frac{1}{n+1} E\{d_{0,n}(X^n, Y^n)\} \leq D + \epsilon$$

Definition 2.7: (Causal Rate Distortion Function) The CRDF $R(D)$ is the infimum of rates R such that (R, D) is achievable.

The definition of the coding theorem can be done for i) stationary ergodic processes $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots\}$ by invoking versions of Shannon-McMillan-Breimann Theorem, ii) for information and distortion stable processes by invoking versions of Dobrushin's conditions, and iii) for processes with information spectrum via variants of the methods in [4].

Here we discuss ii) since the distortion function $d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n)$ is general and does not fall under the special case discussed in [[2], Section 9.8] for ergodic sources.

Define the information density consistent with the causal reproduction coder by $\Lambda_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) \triangleq \log \frac{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)}{P_{Y^n}(dy^n)}$ where it is assumed absolute continuity $\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(\cdot|x^n) \ll P_{Y^n}(\cdot)$, $\mu_{0,n} - a.s.$ for almost all $x^n \in \mathcal{X}_{0,n}$. Then $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(P_{X^n}, \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}) = E\{\Lambda_{0,n}(x^n, y^n)\}$, where the joint distribution is $P_{X^n, Y^n} = P_{X^n} \otimes \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}$.

Definition 2.8: (Information and Distortion Stable) For each $\epsilon > 0$ define the ϵ -typical set of directed information density

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \triangleq \left\{ (x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n} : \left| \frac{1}{n+1} \log \frac{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)}{P_{Y^n}(dy^n)} - \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(P_{X^n}, \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}) \right| < \epsilon \right\}$$

and the ϵ -typical set of the distortion by

$$\mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{(n)} \triangleq \left\{ (x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n} : \left| \frac{1}{n+1} d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) - \frac{1}{n+1} E\{d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n)\} \right| < \epsilon \right\}$$

The process $\{(X_n, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is called directed information and distortion stable if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob}(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) = 1$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob}(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{(n)}) = 1$, respectively, for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Note that for stationary ergodic process $\{(X_n, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and certain distortion functions (see [2], Section 9.8) information and distortion stability follows. Before the statements leading to coding theorem are introduced, the notion of stability of the source is required.

Definition 2.9: The source $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is called stable if for any given $D > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\{(X_n, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is directed information and distortion stable, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} E\{d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n)\} \leq D \quad (8)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} E\left\{\log \frac{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)}{P_{Y^n}(dy^n)}\right\} \leq R^c(D) + \epsilon \quad (9)$$

where $E\{\cdot\}$ is with respect to $P_{X^n, Y^n} = \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n} \otimes P_{X^n}$. Note that by specializing $d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n)$ to distortion functions that satisfy sub-additivity property the limit in (8) exists. Utilizing Definition 2.9, it can be shown that the following statements hold, which are vital in establishing the coding theorem.

Lemma 2.10: Assume $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is stable and the joint distribution P_{X^n, Y^n} is defined by $P_{X^n, Y^n}(dx^n, dy^n) = \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) \otimes P_{X^n}(dx^n)$.

Then

- 1) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{X^n, Y^n}(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{X^n, Y^n}(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon^{(n)}) = 1$
- 2) For sufficiently large n , there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)}{P_{X^n}(dx^n)} \leq 2^n (\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(P_{X^n}, \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}) + 3\epsilon)$$

Using Lemma 2.10, the source coding theorem stated below can be established.

Theorem 2.11: (Source Coding Theorem) Assume $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is stable and $\sup_{(x^i, y^i) \in \mathcal{X}_{0,i} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,i}} \rho_i(x^i, y^i) < k$, $k < \infty$ for all i . If $R > R^c(D)$ then for any $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n , there exists an $(n, 2^{nR}, D)$ causal code which satisfies the average distortion $\frac{1}{n+1} E_{P_{X^n, Y^n}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n+1} d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) \right\} \leq D + \delta$.

Proof: The derivation utilizes Lemma 2.10, and random codebook generation. Fix $\vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n)$, which achieves the equality in $R^c(D)$ (e.g., (7)). Calculate $\vec{P}_{Y^n}(dy^n) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n}} \vec{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(dy^n|x^n) P_{X^n}(dx^n)$. Randomly generate rate distortion codebook $\mathcal{C}$ of 2^{nR} sequences Y^n according to $\vec{P}_{Y^n}(dy^n)$ and reveal the codebook to encoder and decoder. Utilizing Lemma 2.10 and Definition 2.9, the result is obtained following [3]. ■

III. EXISTENCE OF OPTIMAL CAUSAL RECONSTRUCTION

In this section, the existence of the minimizing causal product kernel in (7) is shown by using the topology of weak convergence of probability measures on Polish spaces.

The only assumptions required are 1) $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$ is a compact Polish space, 2) $\mathcal{X}_{0,n}$ is a Polish space, and 3) $d_{0,n}(x^n, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$.

A. Weak Compactness and Existence of Optimal Reconstruction Kernel

Define the family of measures

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n}) &= \{ \vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) : \vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \\ &= \otimes_{i=0}^n q_i(dy_i; y^{i-1}, x^i) \} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1: Let $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$ be a compact Polish space and $\mathcal{X}_{0,n}$ a Polish space.

Then

- 1) The family of measures $\vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \in \vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ is compact.
- 2) Under the assumption that $d_{0,n}(x^n, \cdot)$ is continuous in $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$ the set $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}_{0,n}(D)$ is a closed subset of $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$.

Proof: 1) This follows from the fact that any $\vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) \in \vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ is factorized as $\vec{q}_{0,n}(dy^n; x^n) = \otimes_{i=0}^n q_i(dy_i; y^{i-1}, x^i)$, where $q_i(dy_i; y^{i-1}, x^i) \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_i; \mathcal{Y}_{0,i-1} \times \mathcal{X}_{0,i})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$ compact Polish space implies that $\{q_i(\cdot; y^{i-1}, x^i) : y^{i-1} \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,i-1}, x^i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,i}\}$ is compact, $\forall i$. Utilizing this, by induction it can be shown that the family of convolution measures $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ is compact.

2) Utilizing compactness of $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ and the assumption on $d_{0,n}(x^n, \cdot)$ it can be shown that $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}_{0,n}(D)$ is a closed subset of $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$. ■

The next theorem establishes existence of the minimizing reconstruction kernel for (7).

Theorem 3.2: Suppose $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$ is compact Polish space and $d_{0,n}(x^n, \cdot)$ is continuous in $\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}$. Then $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ has a minimum.

Proof: The assumptions are sufficient to show lower semicontinuity of the functional $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ with respect to $\vec{q}_{0,n}$ for a fixed $\mu_{0,n}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1, 2) since $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}_{0,n}(D)$ is a closed subset of a compact set $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$, then $\vec{\mathcal{Q}}_{0,n}(D)$ is also compact. By Weierstrass theorem existence follows. ■

IV. OPTIMAL CAUSAL RECONSTRUCTION

In this section the form of the optimal causal reconstruction kernel is derived and the properties of $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ are discussed under a stationarity assumption.

A. Optimal Reconstruction

Assumption 4.1: The family of measures that admits the factorization $\vec{q}(dy^n|x^n) = \otimes_{i=0}^n q_i(dy_i|y^{i-1}, x^i)$ is the convolution of stationary conditional distributions.

Assumption 4.1 holds for stationary ergodic process $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\rho_i(x^i, y^i)$, which is stationary and time-invariant $\forall i$. The method is based on calculus of variations

on the space of measures [14]. Utilizing Assumption 4.1, which holds for stationary ergodic processes $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and single letter distortion function or distortion function discussed in [2], Section 9.8], the Gateaux differential of $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ is done in only one direction (since $q_i(dy_i; y^{i-1}, x^i)$ are stationary). This simplifies the calculations of Gateaux derivative of $\mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$.

Theorem 4.2: Suppose $\mathbb{I}_{\mu_{0,n}}(\vec{q}_{0,n}) \triangleq \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n})$ is well defined for every $\vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)$ possibly taking values from the set $[0, \infty)$. Then $\vec{q}_{0,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_{\mu_{0,n}}(\vec{q}_{0,n})$ is Gateaux differentiable at every point in $\vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)$, and the Gateaux derivative at the point $\vec{q}_{0,n}^0$ in the direction $\vec{q}_{0,n} - \vec{q}_{0,n}^0$ is given by

$$\delta \mathbb{I}_{\mu_{0,n}}(\vec{q}_{0,n}^0; \vec{q}_{0,n} - \vec{q}_{0,n}^0) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,n}} \log \left(\frac{\vec{q}_{0,n}^0(dy^n; x^n)}{\nu_{0,n}^0(dy^n)} \right) (\vec{q}_{0,n} - \vec{q}_{0,n}^0)(dy^n; x^n) \mu_{0,n}(dx^n) \quad (10)$$

where $\nu_{0,n}^0 \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n})$ is the marginal measure corresponding to $\vec{q}_{0,n}^0 \otimes \mu_{0,n} \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n} \times \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$.

Proof: The proof utilizes Assumption 4.1. ■

The constrained problem defined by (7) can be reformulated using Lagrange multipliers as follows (equivalence of constrained and unconstrained problems follows from [14]).

$$R_{0,n}^c(D) = \sup_{s \leq 0} \inf_{\vec{q}_{0,n} \in \vec{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})} \left\{ \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{I}_{X^n \rightarrow Y^n}(\mu_{0,n}, \vec{q}_{0,n}) - s(\ell(\vec{q}_{0,n}) - D) \right\} \quad (11)$$

and $s \in (-\infty, 0]$ is the Lagrange multiplier.

Note that $\vec{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_{0,n}; \mathcal{X}_{0,n})$ represents the causality constraint set. Therefore, one should introduce another set of Lagrange multipliers to obtain an optimization without constraints. This process is involved hence we state the main results.

Theorem 4.3: Suppose Assumption 4.1 and $d_{0,n}(x^n, y^n) = \sum_{i=0}^n \rho_i(x^i, y^i)$ hold. The infimum in (11) is attained at $\vec{q}_{0,n}^* \in \vec{Q}_{0,n}(D)$ given by

$$\vec{q}_{0,n}^*(dy^n; x^n) = \otimes_{i=0}^n \frac{e^{s\rho_i(x^i, y^i)} \nu_i^*(dy_i; y^{i-1})}{\int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} e^{s\rho_i(x^i, y^i)} \nu_i^*(dy_i; y^{i-1})} \quad (12)$$

and $\nu_i^*(dy_i; y^{i-1}) \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y}_i; \mathcal{Y}_{0,i-1})$. The causal rate distortion function is given by

$$R_{0,n}^c(D) = sD - \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,i} \times \mathcal{Y}_{0,i-1}} \log \left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} e^{s\rho_i(x^i, y^i)} \nu_i^*(dy_i; y^{i-1}) \right) \vec{q}_{0,i-1}^*(dy^{i-1}; x^{i-1}) \otimes \mu_{0,i}(dx^i) \quad (13)$$

If $R_{0,n}^c(D) > 0$ then $s < 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,i}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_{0,i}} \rho_i(x^i, y^i) \vec{q}_{0,i}^*(dy^i; x^i) \mu_{0,i}(dx^i) = D$$

Proof: The fully unconstrained problem of (11) is obtained by introducing another set of Lagrange multipliers. Using this and Theorem 4.2 we obtain (12) and (13). ■
Note that according to Assumption 4.1, the terms appear in the right side of (12) are identical.

B. PROPERTIES OF $R_{0,n}^c(D)$

In this section, we present some important properties of the CRDF as it is defined in (7).

Theorem 4.4:

- 1) $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ is a convex, non-increasing function of D
- 2) If $\rho_i \in L^1(\pi_i)$ then
 - a) $R_{0,n}^c(\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n E_{\pi_i}(\rho_i)) = 0$;
 - b) $R_{0,n}^c(D)$ is non-increasing for $D \in [0, D_{max}]$ where $D_{max} = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n E_{\pi_i}(\rho_i)$ and $R_{0,n}^c(D) = 0$ for any $D \geq D_{max}$
- 3) $R_{0,n}^c(D) > 0$ for all $D < D_{max}$ and $R_{0,n}^c(D) = 0$ for all $D \geq D_{max}$, where

$$D_{max} = \min_{\{y^n\} \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,n}} \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}_{0,i}} \rho_i(x^i, y^i) \mu_{0,i}(dx^i)$$

if such a minimum exists.

Proof: Omitted due to space limitation. ■

V. CONCLUSION

The solution of the CRDF subject to a reconstruction kernel which is a convolution of causal kernels is presented, on abstract alphabets. Some of its properties are also presented. It is believed that the optimal reconstruction kernel as a convolution of causal kernels has several implications in applications where causality of the decoder as a function of the source is of concern. Specific example by invoking (11) will be part of the final paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006.
- [2] R. T. Gallager, *Information theory and Reliable Communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1968.
- [3] S. Ihara, *Information theory - for continuous systems*. World Scientific, 1993.
- [4] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, "Approximation theory of output statistics," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752 – 772, may 1993.
- [5] I. Csiszár, "On an extremum problem of information theory," *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, vol. 9, pp. 57 – 71, 1974.
- [6] D. Neuhoff and R. Gilbert, "Causal source codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 701 – 713, sep 1982.
- [7] T. Weissman and N. Merhav, "On competitive prediction and its relation to rate-distortion theory," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 3185–3194, dec. 2003.
- [8] T. Linder and R. Zamir, "Causal coding of stationary sources and individual sequences with high resolution," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 662–680, feb. 2006.
- [9] A. K. Gorbunov and M. S. Pinsker, "Asymptotic behavior of nonanticipative epsilon-entropy for Gaussian processes," *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 361 – 365, 1991.
- [10] M. S. Derpich and J. Østergaard, "Improved upper bounds to the causal quadratic rate-distortion function for gaussian stationary sources," *Accepted in IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, [Online:] Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1001.4181v2>, 2011.
- [11] S. C. Tatikonda, "Control over communication constraints," Ph.D. dissertation, Mass. Inst. of Tech. (M.I.T.), Cambridge, MA, 2000.

- [12] S. Tatikonda, A. Sahai, and S. Mitter, "Stochastic linear control over a communication channel," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1549 – 1561, sept. 2004.
- [13] P. Dupuis and R. S. Ellis, *A weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1997.
- [14] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1969.